

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Status of the Claims:

Claims 1, 31 and 34 are amended to add features of the allowed claim 15. Claim 10 is amended, in part, as suggested by the examiner on page 2 of the Office Action of November 13, 2007.

Claim Objections:

Claim 10 is objected for informalities. The examiner suggested amending the claim to recite “rotation while the cannula is at the subcutaneous position”. In light of the suggested amendments claims 10 is amended to recites, among other features:

...

adjusting a position of the delivery tubing, to rotate more than 5 degrees while a cannula is at a subcutaneous position and the rotation is limited to less than 360 degrees in a rotational direction around an axis that is substantially perpendicular to said first surface of said base.

The amendments to claim 10 are similar to those suggested by the examiner. Thus the objection is overcome in a manner as suggested by the Examiner.

Claim rejection under 35 USC 102

Claims 1-14, 26-27, 31-38 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (e) as being anticipated by Kihara et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,379,265). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In the Office Action of November 28, 2007, under the heading Response to Arguments, the Examiner stated that the connector in Kihara et al. is at least partially rotatable when the

cannula is inserted subcutaneously. The Examiner further indicated that claim 15 was allowed because of the range of rotation, while the cannula is inserted at a subcutaneous position.

Independent claims 1, 10, 31 and 34 are amended to recite, among other features, a connector being rotatable more than 5 degrees on said base while the cannula is at a subcutaneous position (allowable feature of claim 15). Kihara et al. fail to disclose a connector that is rotatable more than 5 degrees on said base while the cannula is at a subcutaneous position as indicated by the reason for allowance of claim 15. Thus claims 1, 10, 31 and 34 are believed to be allowable. Because claims 2-9, 11-14, 16-23, 26-28, 32, 33, 35-40 depend directly or indirectly from claims 1, 10, 31 and 34, they are believed to allowable for at least the same reasons claims 1, 10, 31 and 34 are believed to be allowable.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-23, 26-28, 31-40 are pending in this application.

Conclusion:

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check or credit card payment form being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37

C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Date 2/8/08

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 23392
Telephone: (213) 972-4594
Facsimile: (213) 486-0065

Respectfully submitted,

By

Ted R. Rittmaster
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 32,933